



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/519,547	03/06/2000	Jozeph W. Triepels	PHN 17,327	8969

24737 7590 02/25/2004

PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY & STANDARDS  
P.O. BOX 3001  
BRIARCLIFF MANOR, NY 10510

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, TRUC T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2833

DATE MAILED: 02/25/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE  
P.O. Box 1450  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS  
AND INTERFERENCES**

Paper No. 29

Application Number: 09/519,547  
Filing Date: March 06, 2000  
Appellant(s): TRIEPELS ET AL.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Triepels et al.  
For Appellant

**EXAMINER'S ANSWER**

**MAILED**  
FEB 25 2004  
**GROUP 2003**

This is in response to the appeal brief filed August 5, 2003.

Art Unit: 2833

**(1) *Real Party in Interest***

A statement identifying the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

**(2) *Related Appeals and Interferences***

A statement identifying the related appeals and interferences which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the decision in the pending appeal is contained in the brief.

**(3) *Status of Claims***

The statement of the status of the claims contained in the brief is correct.

**(4) *Status of Amendments After Final***

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

**(5) *Summary of Invention***

The summary of invention contained in the brief is correct.

**(6) *Issues***

The appellant's statement of the issues in the brief is correct.

**(7) *Grouping of Claims***

The rejection of claims 1-3 and 5-10 stand or fall together because appellant's brief does not include a statement that this grouping of claims does not stand or fall together and reasons in support thereof. See 37 CFR 1.192(c)(7).

**(8) *Claims Appealed***

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

Art Unit: 2833

**(9) Prior Art of Record**

4,012,117	LAZZERY	3-1977
4,528,500	LIGHTBODY ET AL	7-1985
5,847,783	HIRAMOTO ET AL.	12-1998
5,233,451	IGUCHI	8-1993

**(10) Grounds of Rejection**

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-3, 6, 8, and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lazzery (US 4,012,117) in view of Lightbody et al (US 4,528,500).

Regarding claims 1-2, Lazzery discloses a display device (20) comprising a first substrate (90) having conductor pattern (106) and electrically conducting connections (24) between the pattern and conducting tracks (40) on a support (12), said conducting connection comprising a resilient connection (70, 78).

Lazzery does not disclose the resilient connection comprises a resilient pin which provides variable-pressure metal-metal contact.

Art Unit: 2833

Lightbody et al disclose an electrically conducting connection pin board (11) having a plurality of resilient connection pin (12) providing variable-pressure metal-metal contact.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to substitute the electrically conducting connection pin board of Lightbody et al. for the connector (24) of Lazzery's display device, for ease of replacement when a single contact is malfunction.

Lazzery does not specifically disclose the metal-metal contact is a chosen from the group of gold, silver and nickel. Lazzery only disclose the metal-metal contact is made by copper clad gold. However, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a gold material onto the modified Lazzery's contacts for good conductivity. Since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. *In re Leshin*, 125 USPQ 416.

Regarding claim 3, modified device of Lazzery in view of Lightbody et al discloses the metal-metal contact is present at the area of the first substrate.

Regarding claim 6, modified device of Lazzery in view of Lightbody et al discloses the conductor pattern on the first substrate faces the support.

Regarding claim 8, modified device of Lazzery in view of Lightbody et al discloses the display device comprises a second substrate (92) opposite from part of the first substrate (90) and an electro-optical material (93) between the two substrates, each being provided with substrate electrodes (94) which define pixels with the electro-optical material, the first substrate being

Art Unit: 2833

provided with the conductor pattern beyond the part of the first substrate located opposite the second substrate.

Regarding claim 10, modified device of Lazzery in view of Lightbody et al discloses a part of the conductor pattern is connected in an electrically conducting manner to a conducting track on the side of the support remote from the first substrate.

4. Claims 5 and 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lazzery (US 4,012,117) in view of Lightbody et al (US 4,528,500) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Hiramoto et al (US 5,847,783).

Modified device of Lazzery in view of Lightbody et al substantially discloses the claimed invention except the conducting connection between the resilient conductor and the conductor pattern comprises an anisotropically conducting foil.

Hiramoto et al discloses an anisotropic conductive adhesive (20) is used in the liquid display (column 4, lines 20-23).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide an anisotropical material into Lazzery's conducting connection, as taught by Hiramoto et al for electrically conducting purpose.

Regarding claim 9, modified device of Lazzery in view of Lightbody et al substantially discloses the claimed invention except the display device comprises an electroluminescent material.

Hiramoto et al discloses an electroluminescent layer (15c) is used in the liquid display (column 4, lines 9-13).

Art Unit: 2833

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide an electroluminescent material into Lazzery's liquid display, as taught by Hiramoto et al providing self emitting light to the display.

5. Claim 7 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lazzery (US 4,012,117) in view of Lightbody et al (US 4,528,500) as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Iguchi (US 5,233,451).

Lazzery substantially discloses the claimed invention except the electrically conducting connection comprising a conducting part which encloses the edge of the first substrate.

Iguchi disclose a conducting element (23) which encloses the edge of the substrate (16) for used in a liquid display.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide a conducting element encloses the edge of Lazzery's first substrate, as taught by Iguchi for better electrical connection.

**(11) Response to Argument**

In response to applicant's argument on page 4, line 1 to line 27 of page 5, the Examiner respectfully disagrees for the following reason.

The Examiner recognizes that references cannot be arbitrarily combined and that there must some reason why one skilled in the art would be motivated to make the proposed combination of primary and secondary references. *In re Nomiya*, 184 USPQ 607 (CCPA 1975). However, there is no requirement that a motivation to make the modification be expressly

Art Unit: 2833

that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,





T. Nguyen  
February 12, 2004

Conferees

**GEORGIA Epps - SPE 2873**

**Truc Nguyen**

**Paula Bradley - SPE 2833**

COPORATE PATENT COUNSEL  
U S PHILIPS CORPORATION  
580 WHITE PLAINS ROAD  
TARRYTOWN, NY 10591